

Remarks/Arguments

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application. Claim(s) 1, 16, 22, and 24 have been amended herein. Care has been exercised to introduce no new matter. Claims 1-27 are pending and are now in condition for allowance.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification fails to provide sufficient information to determine the meaning of **intelligent functions**. For purposes of art rejection, the examiner interprets intelligent functions to mean what is known in the art as “trick function (e.g. pause, rewind, etc.).”

Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding Claim 24, “said set-top box to perform intelligent functions” has no antecedent basis. For purposes of art rejection, examiner interprets intelligent functions to mean what is known in the art as “trick function (e.g. pause, rewind, etc.)”

Claim 24 has been amended to delete “to perform intelligent functions.” Claim 24 has now overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph and 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-8, 12-20 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0110468.

Claims 9-11, 21 and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman in view of Parker et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0234804.

The prior art of record does not disclose independent claim 1 as amended; in particular, the prior art of record does not disclose the claim element, “a junction device configured to receive a satellite analog signal and a wireless analog signal.” Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claims 2-15 are also in condition for allowance.

The prior art of record does not disclose independent claim 16 as amended; in particular, the prior art of record does not disclose the claim element, “combining said analog signal using a satellite with said analog signal over a wireless network connection into a junction device.” Claim 16 is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claims 17-21 are also in condition for allowance.

The prior art of record does not disclose independent claim 22 as amended; in particular, the prior art of record does not disclose the claim element, “a combining system for combining said wireless analog signal and said satellite analog signal.” Claim 22 is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claims 23-27 are also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-27 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 202-783-8400 or nberezny@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nema Berezny/

Nema Berezny
Reg. No. 57,706

NB/JJC/bp
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550